EXHIBIT "B" Part 3 of 7

1	any of the lawyers who are
2	representing any of the defendants in
3	this case?
4	A. I don't believe so. I'm
5	not sure I know all the lawyers that
6	are representing the other side.
7	Q. Have you ever worked with
8	Rich Biedryzski?
9	A. The name doesn't sound
10	familiar, no.
11	Q. Jeff Pettit?
12	A. Jeff Pettit is on
13	Q. Other than this case, have
14	you worked with him in the past?
15	A. Oh. I don't believe so,
16	no.
17	Q. Melissa Flax? I'm just
18	going through the names because you
19	said you didn't know all the names.
20	A. Right. Not before this
21	case, no.
22	Q. Tom Sabino?
23	A. Again, same answer.
24	Q. Ed Fackenthal?

1	A. Same answer.
2	Q. Lynn Wright?
3	A. I have worked with Lynn
4	Wright before but not in an expert
5	capacity.
6	Q. And Andy Foster?
7	A. Not prior to this case.
8	Q. And what was the nature of
9	your previous work with Lynn Wright?
10	A. Lynn and I have served on
11	the same Superfund site committee at
12	a site in Old Bridge, New Jersey.
13	For me, it was since 1992, and I
14	believe that Lynn was involved back
15	then and maybe even prior to that
16	time on that site.
17	MS. WRIGHT: It's my
18	retirement package.
19	THE WITNESS: Lynn and I
20	also were involved in another site,
21	Superfund site prior to the Old
22	Bridge site, the one in Winslow
23	Township, and my involvement with
24	that site goes back to 1988. And I

1	don't think Lynn will acknowledge
2	whether she was involved back then or
3	not.
4	BY MS. TROJECKI:
5	Q. There's an e-mail in the
6	documents that were provided to me by
7	the defendant's counsel that's from
8	you that states that you did former
9	work at American Cyanamid's Bound
10	Brook facility?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. What was the nature of that
13	work?
14	A. American Cyanamid was a
15	significant client for BBL until
16	American Home Products purchased
17	American Cyanamid, I think, in 1994
18	or '95.
19	So for the first couple
20	years of my tenure at BBL, I
21	consulted on groundwater issues for
22	the project manager on a number of
23	American Cyanamid sites, including
24	Bound Brook.

1880 JFK Blvd., 6th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19103 www.JDReporting.com

l you describe for me	Q. Could
nd of groundwater	2 further what ki
specifically you did	3 issues or what
ook facility?	4 at the Bound Br
as probably it's	5 A. It wa
years, but it was	
ed to conducting	7 probably relate
	8 groundwater inv
wells, or overseeing	
on of wells, and	
ndwater flow data,	11 looking at grou
	that sort of th
ou were investigating	
issues on the Bound	
site; is that correct?	Brook facility
's correct.	
did that cause you to	
look into the processes	
	at the Bound Br
id not. There were	A. It di
t BBL that were	
e engineering design of	
dments and that sort of	
not involved in that.	24 thing. I was n
dments and that sort o	on-site impound

1	I should say the remediation of
2	onsite impoundments, not the design
3	of the impoundments itself.
4	Q. Was the American Cyanamid
5	site contaminated, the Bound Brook
6	facility site?
7	A. That's a broad question. I
8	prefer not to answer it in that form.
9	Q. Okay, then how do you
10	suggest answering it?
11	A. There was contamination at
12	the American Cyanamid facility that
13	the government was requiring us to
14	investigate and remediate.
15	Q. Did your job involve
16	determining the source of this
17	contamination?
18	A. It did not.
19	Q. Other than investigating
20	the contamination, did you have any
21	other role in any sort of work that
22	was at the Bound Brook facility?
23	A. Not to my knowledge, no.
24	No, I was really primarily brought in

1	just to look at groundwater issues.	
2	Q. How long of a period of	
3	time were you involved in that	
4	project?	
5	A. I don't know exactly, but I	
6	recall that shortly after I started	
7	at BBL I was asked to take a look at	
8	the facility, and if memory serves,	
9	shortly after the acquisition of	
LO	American Cyanamid by American Home	
11	Products, BBL's involvement with the	
12	Bound Brook site was terminated.	
13	And I believe that was in	
14	the mid-1990s, so it couldn't have	
15	been more than a couple of years.	
16	Q. How many times would you	
17	say you were at the Bound Brook	
18	facility?	
19	A. Two. Maybe three.	
20	Q. Did you write any reports	
21	on the Bound Brook facility?	
22	A. I may have been involved in	
23	the preparation of parts of reports,	
24	but I, myself, did not write a	

1	report.
2	Q. Do you recall what reports
3	you may have been involved with?
4	A. I can't recall.
5	Q. And how were you involved?
6	A. As a consulting hydrologist
7	on the project, basically looking at
8	data, determining groundwater flow
9	patterns, looking at impacted
10	groundwater and where that impacted
11	groundwater might be going. I seem
12	to recall looking at relationships
13	between groundwater and the Raritan
14	River adjacent to the site.
15	Q. Did you draft any portions
16	of reports?
17	A. I probably did draft
18	portions of reports, yes.
19	Q. Did you inspect the Bound
20	Brook facility, the manufacturing
21	processes at the Bound Brook
22	facility, at any point?
23	A. The manufacturing
24	processes, as I recall, were largely

1	discontinued by the time I got onto
2	the site, so there were no
3	manufacturing processes. There may
4	have been some, but if there were, I
5	was not aware of them. For the most
6	part that facility was closed, and it
7	was both a Superfund and a RCRA
8	corrective action site at that time.
9	Q. Did you, at any point,
LO	research the historical manufacturing
11	processes as part of your former work
12	at the Bound Brook facility?
13	A. No. That would have fallen
14	way outside of the scope of work I
15	was asked to do.
16	Q. Is the information that you
17	provided in Appendix A of your report
18	up to date?
19	A. It's probably up to date as
20	of this summer.
21	Q. Are there any projects that
22	come to your mind that need to be
23	included into your CV?
24	A. Well, I update the I try

1	to update the CV on the website every
2	six to eight months, so I'm due for
3	an update.
4	Q. But are there any projects
5	that come to your mind sitting here
6	today that you think you need to add
7	to your CV?
8	A. There is a report that I'm
9	doing, a case that I'm involved in,
10	where we're working with Bill Howard
11	at Segal McCambridge here in
12	Philadelphia where I'm it's a
13	litigation, and I will be an expert
14	for Bill's client, the insurance
15	company, and a trucking company on a
16	site in north of Indianapolis,
17	Indiana.
18	Q. And what is the nature of
19	your work in that case?
20	A. Right now the nature of the
21	work is we're attempting to mediate a
22	settlement, so I have attended a
23	mediation session with our team and
24	their team, the opposing side's team,

1	within the last month, and we're
2	hopeful that a settlement is
3	imminent.
4	Q. So what is your role in the
5	mediation, what are you doing for
6	them?
7	A. I'm basically the technical
8	resource for the defense team.
9	Q. And providing what kind of
10	technical expertise?
11	A. Expertise on this is a
12	petroleum distribution terminal that
13	has operated for 70 or 80 years.
14	So our expertise, my
15	expertise is being tapped on best
16	management practices, historical
17	operations of such facilities, the
18	characterization of soil and
19	groundwater contamination,
20	distinguishing that contamination
21	related to a particular spill event
22	from historic contamination on the
23	site, fate and transport of organic
24	constituents in soil and groundwater,

1	and the potential remediation
2	strategies.
3	Q. Going back to your first
4	involvement can you tell me how
5	you first got involved in the
6	Boarhead case, this case?
7	A. Lynn Wright called or
8	e-mailed, I think called, and asked
9	me if I would come up to a meeting of
10	several attorneys in New York City
11	I believe that was in July of 2006,
12	maybe August and discuss a matter
13	that they might like to have me help
14	them with.
15	Q. So during that initial
16	phone call, did Lynn give you any
17	background of the case at all?
18	A. She gave me a very broad
19	overview of the case.
20	Q. What did she say?
21	A. I don't recall. I mean, it
22	was who we would be representing
23	generally, where the site was.
24	Probably not much more than that.

1	Q. So did you have did you
2	go to the meeting?
3	A. I went to the meeting.
4	Q. Who was at the meeting?
5	A. Since I was meeting all
6	these people for the first time, I
7	might get it wrong, but certainly
8	Lynn was there, Melissa was there and
9	two or three others, and I'm not
10	entirely certain I recall.
11	Q. Do you recall if Jeff
12	Pettit was there?
13	A. I think Jeff was there.
14	Q. Seth Cooley, the guy at the
15	end of the table?
16	A. At the time yes, I think
17	Seth was there. There were four or
18	five attorneys in total. And, again,
19	because of the way my mind works, if
20	I'm meeting someone new for the first
21	time and I don't have a firm grasp of
22	their name, I'm probably not going to
23	remember who I saw. I did remember
24	Lynn, though.

1	Q. And what did you talk about
2	at that initial meeting?
3	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
4	THE WITNESS: We talked
5	about what they were looking for in a
6	potential expert, that they needed an
7	expert report fairly quickly. We
8	talked in broad terms about the scope
9	of what the assignment would be and
10	what would need to go into that
11	expert report.
12	We did discuss clearing
13	conflict of interest issues. I
14	needed to know who we would be
15	opposing and make certain that there
16	weren't any conflict concerns with
17	regards to that. So they asked me
18	questions about that with each of the
19	plaintiffs and settled defendants at
20	the time.
21	I think that's probably the
22	substance of our discussion.
23	BY MS. TROJECKI:
24	Q. And when you talked about

1	the broad the scope of the
2	assignment and what would be in the
3	expert report, what were those
4	discussions?
5	A. Generally and, you know,
6	we had to think about what that scope
7	would be collectively over the first
8	couple weeks of the assignment, but,
9	in general terms, they wanted
10	somebody to evaluate and understand
11	the wastes that were generated by the
12	plaintiffs and settled defendants and
13	attempt to categorize and index
14	those. That was essentially it.
15	Q. And what did you speak
16	about with respect to conflicts?
17	A. I mentioned that I have a
18	friend who works at Ford Motor
19	Company and that I have done work for
20	Ford, although not involved in this
21	case, the Boarhead Farms case.
22	I also mentioned that in
23	the early years of my tenure at BBL
24	that I had done work for American

2	Cytec Industries.
3	Q. Anything else?
4	A. I was not aware of any
5	the other companies that were
6	involved didn't ring any bells to me
7	in terms of potential issues or any
8	history.
9	Q. And what was the nature of
10	the work that you did for Ford?
11	A. Well, the first project
12	that I did with Ford was on a
13	Superfund site, in fact, two
14	Superfund sites, the same ones that
15	Lynn and I are working on together,
16	and that would be the KOP site and
17	the EPLC sites, both in New Jersey,
18	where Ford was a PRP, as was
19	Carpenter Technology, Lynn's client.
20	Q. So what work did you do for
21	Ford?
22	A. For Ford directly?
23	Q. Uh-huh.
24	A. As a prime client, I didn't

1	do work directly for Ford as a prime
2 ,	client, but they were one of my
3	clients on those two Superfund sites.
4	Q. So you worked for the
5	take the first site, the KOP site,
6	you were working for a group of PRPs
7	on that site?
8	A. That's correct.
9	Q. Which group?
10	A. I believe they called
11	themselves the KOP site committee.
12	Q. Were they collectively
13	transporters, generators, were they
14	divided in that way?
15	A. I don't have a solid
16	recollection of what the PRP group
17	was.
18	Q. Or how they got to be a
19	committee?
20	A. Yes. There were a number
21	of those PRPs, though, that also were
22	PRPs in the EPLC site, which I'm
23	currently working on.
24	Q. Is Ford a direct client for

you at the EPLC site?
A. They are one of the PRPs at
the EPLC site.
Q. And is there a name of the
group that you are representing in
the EPLC site?
A. They call themselves the
EPLC site settled defendants or
settling parties. I think settling
parties is the term they use.
Q. So how is Ford involved in
the KOP site?
A. I don't know the answer to
that now.
Q. And how about in the EPLC
site?
A. They are a PRP on that
site.
Q. And what is the work you
are doing with respect to that site,
the EPLC site?
A. That is a Blasland, Bouck &
Lee, BBL client, and I am under
contract to BBL to continue to help

1	manage the regulatory compliance, the
2	RI/FS remedy implementation for that
3	site.
4	Q. And what's the nature of
5	your work at the KOP site, or what
6	was it?
7	A. When I left ERM and went to
8	BBL, my involvement with the KOP site
9	terminated.
LO	Q. What were you doing at the
L1	KOP site while you were with ERM?
L2	A. I was the project manager
13	for that site.
14	Q. And what did that entail?
15	A. Overseeing the remedial
16	investigation, risk assessment,
17	engineering feasibility studies under
18	the supervision of EPA Region 2 and
19	the New Jersey DEP.
20	Q. And that was on behalf of
21	the KOP site committee?
22	A. That's correct.
23	Q. Other than categorizing the
24	plaintiffs and settled defendants'

1	wastes and indexing the wastes, to
2	use your term, did you have any other
3	idea after that initial meeting as to
4	what the scope of your work in this
5	matter was supposed to be?
6	A. We had discussed some other
7	ideas related to trying to understand
8	what wastes once we understood
9	what the quantity and types of wastes
10	were that were generated during the
11	period of interest, which we consider
12	to be 1979 to 1987 '69 to '77, I'm
13	sorry, I'm off at that game there
14	was interest in trying to understand
15	which of those wastes might have made
16	their way to the Boarhead Farms site.
17	Q. Anything else?
18	A. No. In broad in a broad
19	way those were the two major issues
20	that we talked about.
21	Q. You can turn to Page 1.1 of
22	your report under Report Objectives.
23	A. I'm sorry, page or section?
24	Q. Section. I mean Page 1-1,

1	Section 1.1. I call your attention
2	to the Report Objectives, and
3	specifically the last sentence or
4	actually it's all one sentence of the
5	first paragraph.
6	A. Yes, it is all one
7	sentence.
8	Q. Where the objective is "to
9	review and summarize available
10	information related to each of the 14
11	plaintiffs and settled defendants'
12	manufacturing processes along with
13	the volume, form and nature of the
14	resulting wastes generated by those
15	processes."
16	Do you see where I'm
17	referring to?
18	A. I do.
19	Q. So that doesn't sound to me
20	that the objective of this report is
21	to determine which wastes went to the
22	Boarhead Farms site; is that correct?
23	A. In general, yes, that's
24	correct.

1	Q. So does the expert report
2	that we marked as Exhibit 1 have any
3	opinion at all with respect to which
4	wastes actually were disposed of at
5	the Boarhead Farms site?
6	A. It does not.
7	Q. So determining which wastes
8	went to the Boarhead Farms site was
9	an option that you explored with
LO	defense counsel as being a part of
L1	your expert report but you ultimately
12	decided not to pursue. Is that fair?
L3	A. That's fair. Yes, that's
	1
L4	correct.
L4 L5	correct. (Discussion off the
L5	(Discussion off the
L5 L6	(Discussion off the record.)
L5 L6 L7	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI:
L5 L6 L7	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI: Q. I will show you what I will
L5 L6 L7 L8	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI: Q. I will show you what I will have marked as Exhibit 2, an e-mail
L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI: Q. I will show you what I will have marked as Exhibit 2, an e-mail from you to Lynn Wright dated August
L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI: Q. I will show you what I will have marked as Exhibit 2, an e-mail from you to Lynn Wright dated August 9, 2006, and attached to that is a
L5 L6 L7 L8 L9 20	(Discussion off the record.) BY MS. TROJECKI: Q. I will show you what I will have marked as Exhibit 2, an e-mail from you to Lynn Wright dated August 9, 2006, and attached to that is a Professional Services Agreement.

1 marked for identification.) 2 BY MS. TROJECKI: 3 First, your e-mail to Lynn Q. 4 Wright references "yesterday's Do you recall if this is 5 meeting." 6 the e-mail that you drafted to Lynn 7 after your initial meeting in New 8 York City? 9 I don't have an exact 10 recollection of what date that 11 meeting was, but it would certainly 12 seem from the language in the e-mail 13 that this was prepared the day after 14 we met in New York City. And do you recall drafting 15 16 an e-mail and attaching a contract --17 and sending a contract to Lynn the 18 day after your initial meeting with 19 her? 20 I remember sending Α. 21 drafting the contract and sending 22 this to her. I can't specifically 23 say it was the day after the meeting, 24 but in looking at this e-mail it

1	would certainly seem reasonable to	
2	reach that conclusion.	
3	Q. And I want to call your	
4	attention to the Scope of Work that's	
5	attached to SEC's proposal, and it	
6	references based on an August 8th,	
7	2006 meeting with Lynn Wright,	
8	Melissa Flax, Seth Cooley, and Jeff	
9	Pettit.	
10	A. By the way, I now remember	
11	who I met with.	
12	Q. Okay. And that's the four	
13	people that are listed under the	
14	Scope of Work?	
15	A. That's correct.	
16	Q. And the last sentence of	
17	the first paragraph of that page,	
18	"SEC will prepare a draft expert	
19	report of its finding" I'm sorry,	
20	wrong sentence.	
21	The sentence that reads	
22	"SEC will assess the available data	
23	and provide an opinion regarding the	
24	nature and magnitude of the	

1	plaintiff's waste streams that were
2	sent to the Boarhead Farms site for
3 .	approval."
4	Again, this Scope of Work
5	that speaks about what wastes were
6	sent to the Boarhead Farms site was
7	not ultimately ever done, correct?
8	A. That is correct.
9	Q. Was this proposal ever
10	signed? The copy that we have marked
11	as Exhibit 2 was not signed.
12	A. It was not eventually
13	signed; however, I did receive an
14	e-mail authorization to proceed with
15	the report.
16	Q. And was there ever a
17	revised Scope of Work that was
18	prepared?
19	A. No.
20	Q. Turning back again to the
21	Scope of Work in Exhibit 2, there's a
22	sentence that reads that "SEC will
23	conduct a review of available
24	environmental data related to the

1	quantities and types of waste
2	materials that the BFAG sent to the
3	Boarhead Farms site. And this data
4	will likely consist of file
5	information on the facility that was
6	developed by the defendants."
7	Do you see that?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. What information or what
LO	file information is that referring to
L1	when it says it was developed by the
L2	defendants?
L3	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
	THE WITNESS: The
L4 L5	
L4	THE WITNESS: The
L4 L5	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they
L4 L5 L6	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that
L4 L5 L6	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that they had received in turn from the
L4 L5 L6 L7	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that they had received in turn from the plaintiffs and settled defendants.
L4 L5 L6 L7	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that they had received in turn from the plaintiffs and settled defendants. I believe I was told at
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that they had received in turn from the plaintiffs and settled defendants. I believe I was told at that time that there was a repository
14 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: The defendants had a repository, as they described to me, of information that they had received in turn from the plaintiffs and settled defendants. I believe I was told at that time that there was a repository of information at your law firm's

ſ	
1	defendants and had been distributed
2	to the attorneys for the defense
3	group.
4	BY MS. TROJECKI:
5	Q. And that's the information
6	that you are referring to when you
7	say that was developed by the
8	defendants?
9	A. Yes. Yes.
10	Q. Do you know why the scope
11	of the work was changed from
12	determining which wastes went to the
13	Boarhead Farms site to just
14	characterizing and quantifying the
15	plaintiffs' wastes?
16	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
17	THE WITNESS: We had
18	discussions between myself and the
19	attorneys about what would be
20	involved in attempting to do to
21	address the issue of what wastes went
22	to the Boarhead Farms site, the
23	amount of effort that would be
24	involved in doing that, and the

1	difficulty associated with trying to	
2	do that in a credible way.	
3	BY MS. TROJECKI:	
4	Q. And based on those	
5	discussions you decided not to	
6	A. We decided for this expert	
7	report not to pursue that path.	
8	Q. What was your first step to	
9	completing your task for this matter?	
10	A. Receiving boxes and boxes	
11	of documents.	
12	Q. After receiving them, you	
13	reviewed all the information in the	
14	boxes; is that correct?	
15	A. I and my colleague on this	
16	project, Valerie Holliday, reviewed	
17	all of the documents in each and all	
18	of the boxes.	
19	Q. And what were you reviewing	
20	the documents for?	
21	A. We were initially just	
22	trying to get a lay of the land, what	
23	is actually included, what types of	
24	material exists.	

1	You know, we had 104(e)
2	response documents from some of the
3	companies, not all. We had
4	deposition transcripts, we had other
5	information from the companies
6	related to their waste generation
7	practices.
8	So we initially just had to
9	try to figure out what was in the
10	boxes and attempt to categorize it by
11	type.
12	Q. And what after that?
13	A. Then we started reviewing
14	every document that was provided to
15	us and compiling tables, making up
16	tables that summarized that
17	information.
18	Q. At what point in time was
19	the scope of the assignment changed?
20	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
21	BY MS. TROJECKI:
22	Q. The scope of your
23	assignment changed from determining
24	which wastes went to the Boarhead

1	Farms site to not addressing that
2	issue?
3	MS. WRIGHT: Objection as
4	to form. It assumes that this is an
5	accurate scope of work that was ever
6	accurate.
7	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure
8	that the scope it's fair to say
9	that the scope of work changed.
10	The scope of work was
11	broadly established in the beginning,
12	and it took some time, probably
13	several weeks until, after reviewing
14	all the documents and as the expert
15	opining as to what I was comfortable
16	being able to say in the time frame
17	that we had to put the report
18	together, we collaborated and evolved
19	into a scope of work that ultimately
20	was manifest by this report.
21	MS. TROJECKI: Want to take
22	a break for lunch?
23	(Thereupon, at 12:03 p.m. a
24	luncheon recess was taken until

12:56 p.m., at which time the 1 2 following proceedings were had:) 3 BY MS. TROJECKI: Before we broke for lunch, 4 Q. we were speaking about -- we had 5 talked about a meeting that you had 6 with several defense counsels in New 7 York City to discuss the scope of 8 9 your report. Did you have any other 1.0 face-to-face meetings with defense 11 12 counsel regarding your expert report 13 since that time? There were, I believe, two 14 Α. face-to-face meetings following the 15 initial meeting in New York. 16 And when was the first one 17 Q. 18 after that initial meeting? I don't recall. I know Α. 19 that we started work in the beginning 20 of August and we finished the report 21 at the end of September, so the two 22 meetings were between those two 2.3 24 dates.

1	Q. And where was the second	
2	meeting?	
3	A. The second meeting, the	
4	first one after New York, was in	
5	Philadelphia.	
6	Q. And what did you discuss at	
7	that meeting?	
8	A. We discussed our	
9	observations regarding the documents	
LO	that we had reviewed. We shared some	
11	thoughts as to where I thought we	
L2	could go with the expert report and	
13	what we decided to ultimately do in	
_4	terms of how to structure the expert	
L5	report.	
L6	Q. And where was the third	
L7	meeting?	
.8	A. That was in Philadelphia	
.9	also.	
20	Q. And what did you discuss at	
21	that meeting?	
22	A. We had produced the expert	
23	report as a draft, and at that point	
24	we were getting comments on the	

- 1	
1	expert report.
2	Q. And that third meeting,
3	then, was after you prepared your
4	first draft of the expert report or
5	after you
6	A. No. We didn't have a draft
7	of the report in that second meeting.
8	Q. So there came a point in
9	time when you produced to the defense
10	counsel a draft expert report.
11	Right?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. Do you recall when that
14	was?
15	A. It was in September, and I
16	think it was towards the end of
17	September, but I couldn't tell you
18	exactly what date.
19	Q. And it was after that time
20	that you first produced your draft
21	expert report to the defendants that
22	you met with the defendants' counsel
23	at this third meeting. Is that
24	right?

1	A. If you could rephrase.
2	Q. I'm just trying to get an
3	idea as to when the last meeting you
4	had with defense counsel was. You
5	said that you discussed the draft
6	report.
7	A. Uh-huh.
8	Q. So was the last meeting
9	after you provided the draft report
LO	to defense counsel?
.1	A. That's correct, yes.
.2	Q. Do you have any sense of
-3	how soon after?
_4	A. Within a couple days.
.5	Q. And what did you discuss at
.6	that meeting?
-7	A. We discussed, basically,
.8	comments on the report. People
.9	you know, we realized that counsel is
20	far more familiar and has worked on
21	this case a lot longer than we had,
22	so if there was a factual statement
:3	of something that they felt was
24	incorrect, we would go back to the

1	original documents and see what the
2	right answer was, that sort of thing.
3	Q. During the second meeting
4	that you had, the second face-to-face
5	meeting, which is the first one in
6	Philadelphia, you said that you
7	discussed observations that you had
8	after reviewing documents and where
9	you were going to go?
LO	A. That's correct.
11	Q. What were your observations
12	at that time?
13	A. Observations initially were
14	that this was an awfully big project
15	with a very short time frame.
16	That, in order to prepare a
17	credible expert report, we would need
18	to focus on those things that we
19	thought we could truly do well in
20	that time frame, and that was using
21	all of the evidentiary material that
22	was produced to get a good
23	understanding of where of what and
24	when it was produced by the
	1

1	plaintiffs and settled defendants
2	during the period of interest.
3	But to take the analysis
4	any further would not be prudent, in
5	my view.
6	Q. Because of timing; is that
7	it?
8	A. Timing and also technical
9	challenge. We hadn't formulated any
10	opinions as to whether anything
11	further could actually be done.
12	We needed to do more
13	research in order to be able to
14	determine whether that could even be
15	a possibility, and we didn't have the
16	time to do that.
17	Q. What was the outcome of
18	that meeting?
19	A. I had a very clear sense of
20	what the expert report was going to
21	consist of, what it was going to
22	focus on, as I had previously
23	mentioned, and what it was not going
24	to mention and address.
- 1	TO MONOTON ANA AAALESS.

Q. And what was it going to
focus on?
A. It was going to focus on an
accurate, as accurate as we could
make it based on evidentiary
material, characterization and
classification of waste materials
produced by the plaintiffs and
settled defendants for the period of
record the period of interest.
Q. Anything else?
A. That was pretty much it.
Q. And during the second
meeting in Philadelphia, did you
discuss anything other than comments
to your draft report?
A. There was no draft report
at the second meeting. The second
Philadelphia meeting?
Q. Yes. Yes.
A. Oh, okay. In the second
Philadelphia meeting, we discussed
the logistics of producing the final
report and its distribution, in

1	addition to comments on the report.
2	Q. How, physically, was the
3	expert report prepared?
4	A. Using a computer.
5	Q. And did you type the expert
6	report?
7	A. I wrote portions of it.
8	Q. And did anybody else write
9	any portions of it?
10	A. One other individual, the
11	person I mentioned previously, my
12	research assistant, Valerie Holliday
13	wrote sections of it under my
14	supervision.
15	Q. And what portions of the
16	report did you draft personally?
17	A. It was a collaborative
18	effort, so it would be impossible for
19	me to say I wrote these five words
20	and Valerie wrote these six words. I
21	wouldn't be able to tell you that.
22	Q. Who is Valerie Holliday?
23	A. Valerie Holliday is a
24	hydrogeologist who works for

1	Geologos, LLC.	
2	Q. And how did you come to	
3	work with Valerie on this project, on	
4	your report?	
5	A. I asked her to provide	
6	assistance as a research scientist on	
7	this effort, and she agreed.	
8	Q. What is your relationship	
9	with GeoLogos?	
10	A. I have a contractual	
11	relationship with GeoLogos whereby,	
12	if I need services that I, as a sole	
13	proprietor company, can't or choose	
14	not to provide, if I need support,	
15	then I can go to GeoLogos and get	
16	that support.	
17	Q. Do you have any ownership	
18	interest in GeoLogos?	
19	A. No.	
20	Q. Did Valerie Holliday draft	
21	the tables that are referenced in the	
22	appendix in your report?	
23	A. Valerie Holliday did the	
24	final compilation in Excel of all of	

1	the	tabl	es,	bе	cau	se I'	m not	that good
2	at E	жсеl	; s	0 W	e w	orked	l	
3	coll	abor	ati	vel	y i	n pul	ling t	hose
4	toge	ther	, b	ut	s h e	was	the ac	tual
5	pers	on t	hat	cr	eat	ed th	e Exce	l output.
6		Q.	F	or	eac	h of	the ta	bles that
7	уou	crea	ted	, f	or	each	plaint	iff and
8	sett	led	def	end	ant	, did	l you h	ave a
9	hand	in	eac	h o	f t	hose,	the	
LO	prep	arat	ion	οf	e a	ch of	those	tables
11	or d	id y	ou	div	ide	up b	etween	you and
L2	Vale	rie,	уο	u k	now	, whi	ch of	you were
L3	goin	g to	ha	ndl	e w	hich	partie	s?
L4		A .	I	οv	ers	aw th	ne enti	re
L5	prep	arat	ion	οf	th.	e rep	ort an	d Valerie
L6	did	thin	gs	at:	m y	reque	est and	
L7	sugg	esti	on.	S	h e	certa	inly p	rovided
L8	idea	s an	d t	hou	ght	s, bu	t they	had to
L9	pass	thr	oug	h m	е.	So a	t the	end of
20	the	day,	an	yth	ing	that	was d	one on
21	that	rep	ort	wa	s d	one w	with my	approval
22	and	supe	rvi	sio	n.			
23		Q.	A	n d	whe	n you	ı first	asked
24	Vale	rie	to	get	in	volve	ed, wha	t was it
1								

1	that you told her that you needed
2	help in, what was it that she was
3	supposed to do?
4	A. We would be given boxes and
5	boxes of documents and that we would
6	go through them. We had joint work
7	sessions. We also had independent
8	work sessions where she would review
9	some material or I would review some
LO	material, and then we would bring
11	that to a meeting, and we met a
12	number of times during the two months
13	that I prepared the report.
14	Q. Did each of you review all
15	of the documents in the boxes?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Did you go back and verify
18	information that may be prepared by
19	Valerie with respect to a particular
20	plaintiff or settled defendant?
21	A. I had her walk me through
22	the construction of the factual
23	information, the tables, the
24	summaries, at a fair level of

1	detail. We did not check every	
2	single document, but we checked a	
3	large percentage of them.	
4	Q. And what are her	
5	credentials, you said she is what	
6	is she?	
7	A. She's a hydrogeologist, has	
8	a master's degree from Lehigh	
9	University in geology, as well as an	
10	undergraduate degree in geology from	
11	Lehigh. She and I have worked on and	
12	off together professionally since	
13	1988.	
14	Q. Who determined what	
15	documents you and Valerie reviewed in	
16	preparing your expert report?	
17	A. That's a hard question to	
18	answer. Certainly, at the first	
19	level, the attorneys representing my	
20	clients made that decision, because	
21	they provided documentation that they	
22	were given and passed it along to us.	
23	However, that's not the	
24	whole answer, because the documents	
ı	i de la companya de	

that they were given came from the 1 plaintiffs and settled defendants. 2 So, ultimately, the 3 plaintiffs -- I think the plaintiffs 4 and settled defendants made the 5 determination as to what we would 6 review, because we reviewed, as I 7 understand it, everything that was 8 made available to our clients, that 9 10 was relevant to this particular 11 expert report. And who determined whether 12 0. it was relevant or not, the defense 13 14 counsel? I would have to say that 15 the defense counsel ultimately 16 17 determined whether it was relevant, 18 although there was obviously a screening of documents sent to 19 20 defense counsel. As you know, we received 21 22 some material from the repository, the Ballard, Spahr repository at the 23 24 end of January, two months after this

1	report was prepared, so there are	
2	still documents coming from the	
3	repository that ideally we should	
4	have seen before we completed this	
5	report.	
6	Q. So I just want to be clear	
7	on this. Defense counsel originally	
8	gave you some documents to look at;	
9	is that correct?	
LO	A. They gave us probably the	
L1	bulk of the documents to look at.	
2	Q. And then you also visited	
_3	the Ballard, Spahr office and	
4	reviewed documents in the repository?	
.5	A. Valerie and I compiled a	
.6	list of documents based on the	
7	initial document review of documents	
-8	that we knew existed but we didn't	
.9	have copies of.	
20	And I honestly don't know	
21	what the process was for production	
22	of those documents. I don't know if	
3	someone walked over here or e-mailed	
24	a request or how that was handled.	

ſ		
1	Q. But there was a list of	
2	documents that you requested through	
3	the defense counsel and they got them	
4	for you?	
5	A. That's correct, yes.	
6	Q. And were there any	
7	documents that you didn't receive	
8	that were on your list?	
9	A. There were documents that	
10	we did not receive as of the time	
11	that this report was prepared.	
12	Q. Do you know why you didn't	
13	receive them?	
14	A. I do not.	
15	Q. Was the list of documents	
16	something that you had typed up, was	
17	it a handwritten list of documents?	
18	A. I think, initially, it was	
19	a handwritten list. We converted	
20	that somehow to an electronic file,	
21	and whether it was an e-mail or a	
22	Word document at the end, I don't	
23	think we sent a handwritten list over	
24	to the repository, but honestly, I	
	1	

1	don't know.	
2	Q. When you say you sent a	
3	handwritten list over to the	
4	repository, do you mean you sent it	
5	to defense counsel to get it from the	
6	repository or you sent it to somebody	
7	directly at my office?	
8	A. Yes, I don't believe I said	
9	that.	
10	What I said was that	
11	initially Valerie and I prepared a	
12	list in handwriting of the documents	
13	we were interested in. How that	
14	ended up getting to the Ballard,	
15	Spahr repository and whether it	
16	stayed in handwritten form or was	
17	converted to type, I don't know.	
18	But there was a list, and	
19	we did convey that list over to	
20	somebody at Ballard, Spahr to produce	
21	the documents.	
22	Q. So that's what I'm asking,	
23	you conveyed a list to somebody	
24	directly at Ballard, Spahr or through	

1	4.6
	defense counsel?
2	A. I did not, no. Yes, we
3	went through defense counsel. Yes.
4	Q. Plaintiffs sent a notice to
5	defense counsel in this case
6	requesting copies of all documents
7	considered by you in preparing your
8	expert report, including draft copies
9	of your report, notes, and,
10	basically, your file.
11	Did the defense counsel ask
12	you to produce your file, do you
13	know, in response to plaintiffs'
14	request?
15	A. They did.
16	Q. And did you produce your
17	file?
18	A. We did.
19	Q. Did you produce any notes
20	that you drafted, that you created
21	while you were working on the expert
22	report?
23	A. Any draft work product
24	notes for the most part, once we were

1	finished with it and it got
2	transmitted into the expert report,
3	our work practice is to throw that
4	stuff away. It's not relevant any
5	longer.
6	So, I believe I haven't
7	seen everything that was conveyed to
8	you, but I believe there was a draft
9	report preceding this version that
LO	was sent over to you, so you have a
.1	copy of the draft report.
.2	Q. Do you have any copies of
.3	your notes today?
L 4	A. No.
-5	Q. Do you have copies of draft
.6	reports?
.7	A. I do not.
.8	Q. Did you destroy copies of
.9	draft reports?
20	A. As we were producing them,
21	yes.
22	Q. Physically you threw them
23	out or you also destroyed them on
24	your computer?

1	A. We got rid of them on the	
2	computer as well as throwing out any	
3	paper. And that was just standard	
4	work practice as we were producing.	
5	Q. So the draft report that I	
6	have, how did that survive?	
7	A. I don't know. If you want	
8	to show me the draft report, I can	
9	talk about it, but I don't have that	
10	in front of me.	
11	Q. But sitting here today, you	
12	are not aware of any drafts of the	
13	expert report that exist?	
14	A. I'm not aware of	
15	everything that we had	
16	electronically, as well as in our	
17	file, we produced to defense counsel	
18	and they, in turn, made a production	
19	to you.	
20	Q. Did you review Vandeven's	
21	expert report in this case?	
22	A. I read it. I did not	
23	critically review it. It fell	
24	outside the scope of work that	

Q. Did you review Exner's
report?
A. I know of its existence. I
didn't go through it in detail.
Q. Did you read it at all?
A. I did read portions of it
just to get a gist of the direction
that he was going.
Q. Did you review Vandeven's
supplemental report?
A. I don't believe so. You
might want to clarify the Vandeven
report. Do you have I just want
to make sure that my recollection is
correct as to exactly what that is.
Q. I don't have a copy of it.
I can get you one. But it's dated
June the 30th, and it's the
plaintiffs' expert report in this
matter.
A. I believe that's the one
that I saw.
MR. COOLEY: For the
record, there are three plaintiffs'

1	reports in this matter.
2	MS. FLAX: I think there
3	are more than that. We have the
4	damages reports as well. It's not
5	artfully stated.
6	BY MS. TROJECKI:
7	Q. Vandeven produced two
8	reports, one dated June 30th and then
9	a supplemental report. You do recall
LO	reading a report by Vandeven.
11	Correct?
12	A. I have a recollection of
13	that. But I would like to see the
14	report to confirm whether that, in
15	fact, is the report that I read, and
16	then I can tell you definitively.
17	Q. But, again, if it's the one
18	that you are thinking of, you just
19	skimmed it, you didn't review it
20	critically. Is that right?
21	A. It was not in my work scope
22	to take any other expert report and
23	do a critical review of it. So, in
24	broad brush, I may have read a

1	report, but I did not critically
2	review it or factor it into my work.
3	Q. What did you do to prepare
4	for today's deposition?
5	A. I met with counsel
6	yesterday for about an hour, hour and
7	a half. I did another read of my
8	expert report, since we had produced
9	it several months ago. I wanted to
10	try to bring the recollection fresh.
11	That's pretty much it.
12	Q. And who did you meet with
13	yesterday for that hour, hour and a
14	half?
15	A. I met with Jeff and Lynn
16	and Ed and who else was there?
17	Lynn's colleague, Ayana, I believe.
18	MS. HARVEY: Yes, I was
19	there.
20	THE WITNESS: Lynn, Ed, and
21	Jeff.
22	BY MS. TROJECKI:
23	Q. And what did you discuss
24	yesterday with Lynn, Ed, and Jeff?

1	A. For the most part, what we
2	discussed was the response that we
3	had to the supplemental material that
4	was produced by the Ballard, Spahr
5	repository.
6	We had received that
7	information towards the end of
8	January and drafted modifications,
9	proposed modifications to the expert
10	report in some of the tables based on
11	the additional information that we
12	had received.
13	Counsel had not seen that
14	additional work until yesterday, and
15	we brought that to the meeting, I
16	brought that to the meeting for the
17	purpose of having a conversation
18	about it and giving counsel the
19	option to produce it to you, which I
20	believe they did.
21	Q. Anything else?
22	A. No. I think there was a
23	general discussion about the form of
24	the deposition, you know, how long it

1 might go, it would probably be all 2 day, pretty much that's it, 3 general description of what we might 4 face, but nothing in any detail. 5 Did you review any other 6 documents other than your expert 7 report in preparation for your 8 deposition today? 9 Everything that I No. 10 reviewed was related to the expert 11 report. 12 may have pulled that out 13 over the last couple weeks, 14 know I did because of the 15 supplemental material that came in, 16 in our preparation of that, some of 17 the background documents that are 18 listed in the references section, s o 19 that we could corroborate the new 20 material that we were seeing with our 2.1 understanding of what we had seen 22 prior. 23 Did you, at any point 24 throughout your work in this matter,

1	talk with any representatives of the
2	defendants themselves? Did you speak
3	with anybody who was a representative
4	of the individual defendant clients?
5	A. To the best of my
6	knowledge, no. I believe that the
7	people that I spoke with were counsel
8	to those clients.
9	Q. Did you visit the Boarhead
10	site at any time?
11	A. I did not.
12	Q. Can you turn to Page 1-1 of
13	your report and the Report
14	Objective. We talked about this a
15	little bit earlier. I just wanted to
16	confirm or get a better sense of what
17	the objective of this report is.
18	When you say you were to
19	review and summarize available
20	information, what were you reviewing
21	and summarizing available information
22	for?
23	A. I'm not sure I understand
24	the question.

	l						
1	Q .	Ιn	the	las	st sect	tion of	f the
2	first para	gra	a p h	unde	er Repo	rt	
3	Objectives	٠, ٢	you	say	that "	'The	
4	objective	οf	thi	s re	port w	as to	
5	review and	l st	ımma	rize	e avail	able	
6	informatio	n.'	•				
7	A .	Uh-	- huh	. У	Zes.		
8	Q .	Wha	at w	as t	the sco	pe of	that
9	review? W	hat	. we	re y	ou rev	riewing	g that
10	informatio	n f	or?				
11	A .	Wе	wer	e re	viewir	ng the	
12	informatio	n t	o a	sses	s, dur	ing th	ı e
13	period of	int	ere	st,	what e	ach of	the
14	plaintiffs	a n	nd s	ett1	ed def	endant	s
15	generated	i n	ter	ms o	f haza	rdous	
16	wastes, co	nst	itu	ents	that	would	$n \in d$
17	to be take	n c	ff	site	for d	lisposa	ıl,
18	based and	usi	ng	excl	usivel	ythe	
19	plaintiffs	' a	nd	sett	led de	fendan	ıts'
20	own record	s c	n t	he m	atter,	as we	ll as
21	deposition	te	sti	mony	from	previo	us
22	court proc	e e d	ling	s.			
23	Q.	So	w h e	n yo	u say	availa	able
24	informatio	n,	wha	t yo	u mean	by th	at is

1	the documents that were produced from
2	
	the repository or deposition
3	transcripts; is that correct?
4	A. I believe that's correct;
5	however, I have no way of knowing
6	that everything that was in those
7	boxes and boxes came exclusively from
8	the repository, because I didn't
9	retrieve them from the repository. I
10	believe they came from the
11	repository.
12	Q. Did you do any independent
13	research or, you know, outside
14	research of any of the plaintiffs or
15	settled defendants to determine what
16	their waste would have been?
17	A. No, not to address that
18	issue.
19	Q. And it states that you were
20	reviewing the information related to
21	each of the plaintiff and settled
22	defendant manufacturing processes
23	along with the volume, form, and
24	nature of the resulting waste. What

1	do you mean by form of the waste?
2	A. Whether it was a gas, a
3	liquid, or a solid.
4	Q. And what do you mean by
5	nature of the waste?
6	A. Whether it was and,
7	again, there is some overlap here,
8	but nature of the waste would be
9	whether it was bulked or in drums.
10	Q. And when you say you
11	reviewed and summarized available
12	information, what expertise did you
13	apply in summarizing the information
14	from the documents you reviewed?
15	A. I used my expertise in
16	understanding the hazardous substance
17	list, the CERCLA hazardous substance
18	list; the classifications of
19	different types of hazardous wastes;
20	the kinds of containers and vessels
21	that typically are used for
22	transporting such material; and
23	probably other knowledge that off the
24	top of my head I can't put my hands

1	on.
2	But, I mean, it was an
3	understanding of, and years of
4	experience in dealing with, hazardous
5	wastes generated in the 1960s and
6	1970s.
7	Q. Do the wastes that are
8	referenced in your expert report from
9	the plaintiffs and the settled
10	defendants, are those wastes all
11	hazardous wastes?
12	A. It would be
13	Q. Or did you render an
14	opinion about that?
15	A. I did not render an opinion
16	on that.
17	Q. So how did your
18	understanding the CERCLA hazardous
19	substances list, how did that help
20	you in summarizing the documents?
21	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
22	THE WITNESS: It helped in
23	terms of understanding what was a
24	chemical waste, what was a

1 constituent. Keep in mind that the 2 EPA, through their consultants CH2M 3 HILL, conducted an investigation of 4 the Boarhead Farms site and 5 identified categories of materials 6 that had been sent there, not only in 7 terms of its form, drum, bulk, et 8 cetera, but also its composition. 9 So while we never rendered 10 an opinion with regards to whether a 11 particular molecule of waste ended up 12 at Boarhead Farms, it was important 13 to understand what the universe of constituents of concern would possibly be. 16 But, in the end, we were looking at everything other than municipal refuse in terms of the categories of wastes, the stuff that you typically report in a 104(e) notice, that sort of thing. Q. am going to have marked as Exhibit 3 a draft copy of your It's attached to an expert report.

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	e-mail that is sent from Valerie
2	Holliday to defense counsel on
3	September 19th, 2006.
4	(Hochreiter Exhibit 3 was
5	marked for identification.)
6	BY MS. TROJECKI:
7	Q. I am going to ask you to
8	turn to Page 1-1 of Exhibit 3.
9	A. Okay. I just want to look
LO	at the if you would give me a
ll	minute here, I just want to see what
12	this is.
13	Q. Sure.
14	A. 1-1?
15	Q. Uh-huh. And under Section
16	1.1, Report Objectives. In Paragraph
17	B, it states that one of the report
18	objectives at the time that this
19	report was prepared was to "Indicate
20	whether the waste generated by each
21	party during the period of time of
22	interest contained hazardous
23	substances."
24	Do you see that?

1	A. Yes, I do.
2	Q. And just to clarify, that
3	was not something that you did in
4	your final expert report; is that
5	correct?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. Paragraph C states that you
8	were at that time to "Indicate
9	whether the hazardous substances
LO	generated by each party are of the
11	same type found at the Boarhead Farms
12	site that contributed to the need for
L3	remediation."
L4	Do you see that?
L5	A. I do.
L6	Q. And was that something that
L7	you ultimately did in your expert
L8	report in this matter?
L9	A. No, I did not.
20	Q. So you did not render an
21	opinion regarding B or C in this
22	draft report, correct?
23	A. That is correct.
24	Q. And this report also

1	discusses, this report meaning
2	Exhibit 3, the qualification of the
3	plaintiffs' and settled defendants'
4	wastes
5	A. I'm sorry, where are you?
6	Q. Section 2.4 and 2.3
7	sorry, 2.4. I just want to confirm
8	that qualifying any of the
9	plaintiffs' and settled defendants'
10	wastes was not something that you did
11	or have an opinion about with respect
12	to your final expert report; is that
13	correct?
14	A. I'm not sure that I
15	understand the question.
16	Quantification or qualification?
17	Q. Qualification. Section 2.4
18	of this draft report.
19	A. Let's look at this for a
20	minute and see what we meant at that
21	time by qualification.
22	MS. FLAX: Are you
23	referring to a particular provision
24	on that page, a particular paragraph,

1	Amy, that you are directing him to
2	look at?
3	MS. TROJECKI: Section 2.4,
4	Qualification of PSD Wastes, uh-huh.
5	THE WITNESS: Okay, now I
6	can answer your question, if you
7	would restate.
8	BY MS. TROJECKI:
9	Q. Was qualifying plaintiffs'
10	and settled defendants' wastes
11	something that you ultimately did in
12	your final expert report in this
13	matter?
14	A. If by qualification we mean
15	in this draft, in Exhibit 3 on Page
16	2-5, the three numbered qualifying
17	criteria, the answer is no, we did
18	not.
19	Q. What do you believe is the
20	importance of the information in your
21	expert report, your final expert
22	report?
23	MS. WRIGHT: Objection. I
24	don't understand that.

1	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure
2	I understand it either.
3	BY MS. TROJECKI:
4	Q. Let's make sure let's go
5	back and lay the foundation. So the
6	scope of your expert report is to
7	summarize and review information and
8	quantify plaintiffs' and settled
9	defendants' wastes; is that correct?
10	A. Yes.
11	Q. Why do you believe that's
12	important?
13	A. I believe it's been
14	established by others, and perhaps by
15	the plaintiffs and settled defendants
16	themselves, that they contracted with
17	individuals that were involved with
18	the Boarhead Farms Superfund site for
19	the disposal of waste.
20	We were interested in
21	identifying the types of wastes,
22	quantities of wastes, that each of
23	these companies likely produced
24	during that eight-year period.

1	We did not opine as to
2	where that waste ultimately went,
3	because, quite frankly, we did not
4	have enough information and enough
5	time to be able to investigate that
6	thoroughly and to a level of comfort
7	that I would be willing to put in a
8	report.
9	So your question is why is
10	that relevant?
11	Q. Uh-huh.
12	A. You want to establish that
13	wastes were actually created by
14	entities, potential responsible
15	parties at a site before you start
16	trying to determine whether their
17	wastes actually ended up there.
18	Q. Turning to I want to
19	call your attention to
20	A. The same exhibit?
21	Q your expert report,
22	Section 2.2. I want to walk you
23	through your methodology.
24	A. Page or section?

1	1	
1	Q. B	soth.
2	A. S	Sections are small, it's
3	easy	
4	Q. 0	kay, let's go by section,
5	Section 2.2	, Paragraph 1. What is
6	the basis o	f your defining the period
7	of interest	as from 1969 to 1977?
8	A. T	hat is our understanding
9	based on re	cord documents, including
10	things like	the CH2M HILL reports and
11	other docum	ents, identifying the time
12	frame that	the Boarhead Farms site
13	was used fo	or the disposal of waste
14	material th	at was brought to it.
15	Q	So that is not the time
16	frame that	any particular plaintiff
17	or settled	defendant was in
18	operation?	
19	A. I	It has no relevance to the
20	time period	d of operation of a
21	plaintiff o	or settled defendant, with
22	one excepti	on, and that is that, in
23	all instanc	ces, we believed that, and
24	we had info	ormation to suggest for